



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,412	09/24/2001	Noboru Kageyama	32213M015	5634

7590 02/07/2003

Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP
Beveridge, DeGrandi, Weilacher & Young
Intellectual Property Group
1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	960 417	Applicant(s)	
Examiner	M. Bujd	Group Art Unit	2834

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-3-03

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1, 5-13 and 17-33 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 5-13 and 17-33 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims, 5-13 and 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matanaka in view of Gore.

Matanaka (figs. 2, 9, 26 and 27) teaches a multi layer ceramic package with a piezo element mounted in a cavity and protected by a cover on one side of substrate while an IC chip is formed on the opposite side of the substrate. Lead electrodes are taken out of the package on the same side as the IC chip is mounted. The IC chip and other components are encapsulated. A structure which includes the output electrodes projects beyond the IC and components, providing the necessary stand-off so that this side can be mounted to a printed circuit board. Solder balls are not explicitly used to connect the structure to the PCB. However, Gore (fig. 8), explicitly teaches using solder balls to both stand-off and electrically couple an electronic package to a printed circuit board. This allows connections to be made either by reflow soldering or ultrasonic bonding to form strong, mechanical and electrical and electrical connections. Thus at least those reasons it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use solder balls as e.g. #11a, #11b in Hatanaka.

Further cited of interest are Fukiharu and Yatsuda.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,412

Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

Budd/ek

02/04/03


MARY BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 212